



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/309,161	05/10/1999	LAWRENCE CUI	OLAL1006.002	7164
23910	7590	07/22/2003		
FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY, LLP FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER SUITE 400 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			EXAMINER	
			PAULA, CESAR B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/309,161	CUI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CESAR B PAULA	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE filed on 5/16/2003.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1-14 are pending in the case. Claims 1-2, and 14 are independent claims.

3. The rejection of claims 1-9, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quinlan et al, hereinafter Quinlan (Pat. # 6,397,253 B1, 5/28/02, filed on 10/6/98), in view of Wagner (Pat. # 6,085,224, 7/4/00, filed on 3/11/97), further in view of Langford (Pat. # 6,507,911 B1, 1/14/03, filed on 7/22/98), and further in view of McGee (Pat. # 6,393,468 B1, 5/21/02, filed on 3/13/98) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

4. The rejection of claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quinlan et al, hereinafter Quinlan, in view of Wagner, further in view of Langford, further in view of McGee, and further in view of Olden (Pat. # 6,460,141 B1, 10/1/02, filed on 10/28/98) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Appropriate corrections have been made to claims 2, 10, 12, and 14 therefore, its 35 U.S.C. 112 lack of antecedent basis rejection has been withdrawn.

7. Claim 1 recites “stripping off any cookies....and storing the cookies in a repository” lines 4-5. There is insufficient information in the specification disclosure to support the storing of stripped cookies in the repository.

8. Claims 2-13 recite “removing cookies....and storing information contained in each cookie in a cookie repository” claim 2, lines 3-4. There is insufficient information in the specification disclosure to support the storing of removed cookies in the repository.

9. Claim 11 recites “storing the information from the cookie repository when the lifetime expires” line 2. There is insufficient information in the specification disclosure to support the storing of information from the cookie repository.

10. Claim 14 recites “removing information from a document and storing that information in a repository” line 2. There is insufficient information in the specification disclosure to support the storing of removed cookies in the repository.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner (Pat. # 6,085,224, 7/4/00, filed on 3/11/97), in view of McGee (Pat. # 6,393,468 B1, 5/21/02, filed on 3/13/98).

Regarding independent claim 1, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers (col. 2, lines 1-67, col.3, lines 1-67). Wagner fails to explicitly teach *generating a session id to identify a new session*. However, McGee discloses the generation of a user's session index or *session id* (col. 9, lines 14-21, col.10, lines 34-67, and col.11, lines 56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have generated the session id, and combine the teachings of Wagner, and McGee, because McGee teaches the closing of the browsing session if the time between server access exceeds a time-out period. Thus, the session id provides the benefit of saving server resources by avoiding tying up server resources unnecessarily, when a user has not access the server in a predetermined lengthy amount of time.

Furthermore, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers sent to a user. The cookies are stored in a web server which introduces these cookies into the header of a

requested web page (col. 2, lines 1-67, col.3, lines 1-67). Wagner fails to explicitly teach *appending the session id to all of the links embedded in the response page and sending the modified response page, with the new header*. However, McGee discloses the appending of a user's session index or *session id* to all the URLs embedded in a web pages (col.10, lines 34-67, col.11, lines 56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have appended the session id to the links in the web page, and combine the teachings of Wagner, and McGee, because McGee discloses a system where only authorized users can access web pages (col.4, lines 43-67), so that the information would be safeguarded by providing it to valid users, and denying it to unauthorized users.

Regarding independent claim 2, Wagner discloses the requesting, and browsing of web pages from a web server by a web browser (col. 2, lines 1-67, col.3, lines 1-67). Wagner fails to explicitly teach *generating a unique session id in response to a request from a client browser*. However, McGee discloses the generation of a user's session index or *session id* (col. 9, lines 14-21, col.10, lines 34-67, and col.11, L.56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have generated the session id, and combine the teachings of Wagner, and McGee, because McGee teaches above the closing of the browsing session if the time between server access exceeds a time-out period. Thus, the session id provides the benefit of saving server resources by avoiding tying up server resources unnecessarily, when a user has not access the server in a predetermined lengthy amount of time.

Furthermore, Wagner discloses the removal or deletion of cookies from web page response headers in a web page before it is sent to a user's browser. The cookies are stored in a

web server which introduces these cookies into the header of a requested web page (col. 2, lines 1-67, col.3, lines 1-67). Wagner fails to explicitly teach *appending the unique session id to each URL in the response page before sending the response page to the client browser*. However, McGee discloses the appending of a user's session index or *session id* to all the URLs embedded in a web pages (col.10,lines 34-67, col.11,lines 56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have appended the session id to the links in the web page, and combine the teachings of Wagner, and McGee, because McGee discloses a system where only authorized users can access web pages, so that the information would be safeguarded by providing it to valid users, and denying it to unauthorized users (col.4, lines 43-67).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Wagner discloses determining whether a browser accepts cookies, and if does not deleting those cookies from the HTTP headers (col.2,lines 54-col.3,line 67).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 2, Wagner discloses the access of web pages from a server by a client (col.8, lines 24-col. 9, line 39). Wagner fails to explicitly teach *encrypting the session id*. However, McGee teaches the encrypting of a session index or session id, by masking it within a random 10 digit number (col.11, lines 56-col.12, line 12). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have encrypted the session id, because McGee discloses a system where only authorized users can

access web pages, so that the information would be safeguarded by providing it to valid users, and denying it to unauthorized users (col.4, lines 43-67).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 2, Wagner discloses determining whether a session has expired, and closing the session if it has expired (col.2, lines 54-col.3, line 67). Wagner fails to explicitly teach *checking the request for an existing session id before generating a unique session id*. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have encrypted the session id, because Wagner teaches above the generation of a new session index or id to establish a new session. This provides the advantage of allowing a user to continue browsing after a session has been closed due to inactivity.

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 5, Wagner discloses the retrieval of cookies from a server storage or repository (col.2, lines 31-col. 3, line 67). Wagner fails to explicitly teach *cookie repository corresponding to the existing session id*. However, McGee discloses the generation of a user's session index or *session id* (col. 9, lines 14-21, col.10, lines 34-67, and col.11,L.56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have generated the session id, and combine the teachings of Wagner, and McGee, because McGee teaches above the closing of the browsing session if the time between server access exceeds a time-out period. Thus, the session id provides the benefit of saving server resources by avoiding tying up server resources unnecessarily, when a user has not access the server in a predetermined lengthy amount of time.

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 6, Wagner discloses generating a cookie header, and inserting cookies in the response web page (col. 2, lines 31-67).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 7, Wagner discloses generating a cookie header, and appending cookies in the header of the response web page (col. 2, lines 31-67).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 2, Wagner discloses the retrieval of web pages from an external server storage or repository (col.2, lines 31-col. 3, line 67).

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 2, Wagner discloses the retrieval of cookies from a server storage or repository (col.2, lines 31-col. 3, line 67). Wagner fails to explicitly teach *setting a lifetime for a session corresponding to the unique session id*. However, McGee discloses setting a lifetime for the session index or id to prevent a user from exceeding a time-out period of inactivity (col.8, lines 24-col.9, line 39). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have generated the session id, and combine the teachings of Wagner, and McGee, because McGee teaches above the closing of the browsing session if the time between server access exceeds a time-out period. Thus, the session id provides the benefit of saving server resources by avoiding tying up server resources unnecessarily, when a user has not access the server in a predetermined lengthy amount of time.

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 10, Wagner discloses the removal or deletion of cookies from web page response headers in a web page before it is sent to a user's

browser. The cookies are stored in a web server, which introduces these cookies into the header of a requested web page. The storage takes place during the web browsing session of the client's browser (col. 2, lines 1-67, col.3, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 2, Wagner discloses determining whether a user has disabled cookies' reception in a browser, which is done through a function for deleting the cookies (col.2, lines 54-col.3, line 67).

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 2, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers, and sending the modified web page to a user (c.2,L.54-c.3,L.67). Wagner fails to explicitly teach *receiving the request from the client browser to a proxy server, the proxy server hosting the cookie repository*. McGee teaches a web server HTML page store 360—*proxy server*—located within an Internet server 300 for transmitting requested web pages to a requesting user (col.6,lines 35-67, fig. 3). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stored the cookies in a proxy server repository, and combine Wagner, and McGee, because McGee, because McGee discloses a system where only authorized users can access web pages, so that the information would be safeguarded by providing it to valid users, and denying it to unauthorized users (col.4, lines 43-67).

Regarding independent claim 14, Wagner discloses the removal or deletion of cookies from web page response headers in a web page before it is sent to a user's browser. The cookies are stored in a web server which introduces these cookies into the header of a requested web

page (col. 2, lines 1-67, col.3, lines 1-67). Wagner fails to explicitly teach *appending an identifier to each link in the document and sending that document to the client*. However, McGee discloses the appending of a user's session index or *session id* to all the URLs embedded in a web pages (col.10, lines 34-67, col.11, lines 56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have appended the session id to the links in the web page, and combine the teachings of Wagner, and McGee, because McGee discloses a system where only authorized users can access web pages, so that the information would be safeguarded by providing it to valid users, and denying it to unauthorized users (col.4, lines 43-67).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed 4/15/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicants state that Wagner does not teach stripping the cookies, and storing the cookies in a repository (page 8, lines 7-10). The Examiner disagrees, because Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers sent to a user. The cookies are stored in a web server which introduces these cookies into the header of a requested web page (col. 2, lines 1-67, col.3, lines 1-67).

Moreover, the Applicants state that McGee does not teach appending the session id to all the URLs embedded in a web page (page 8, lines 19-26). The Examiner disagrees, because

McGee discloses the appending of a user's session index or *session id* to all the URLs embedded in a web pages (col.10,lines 34-67, col.11,lines 56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have appended the session id to the links in the web page, and combine the teachings of Wagner, and McGee, because McGee discloses a system where only authorized users can access web pages, so that the information would be safeguarded by providing it to valid users, and denying it to unauthorized users (col.4, lines 43-67).

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Applicants submit that Quinlan does not teach the detection or stripping of cookies (page7,lines 19-22). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection of this limitation above at least in view of the newly crafted rejection.

Moreover, the Applicants state that Langford does not make up for the deficiencies of Wagner, and McGee (page 9, lines 5-17). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection of this limitation above at least in view of the newly crafted rejection.

Further, the Applicants state that Langford the combination of Quinlan, Wagner, McGee, and Langford does not lead to a reasonable expectation of success (page 10, lines 7-20). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection of this limitation above at least in view of the newly crafted rejection.

Regarding claim 1, the Applicants state that there is no motivation to combine the references (page 10, lines 21-24). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection of this limitation above at least in view of the newly crafted rejection.

Regarding claims 2-9, and 12-14, the Applicants state that are not obvious in light of the references (page 11, lines 4-8). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection of this limitation above at least in view of the newly crafted rejection.

Regarding claims 10-11, the Applicants state that Olden does not teach or suggest the setting of a lifetime for a session (page 11, lines 14-19). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection of this limitation above at least in view of the newly crafted rejection.

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Paltenghe et al. (Pat. # **6,421,729**).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- **(703) 746-7238**, (for **After Final** communications intended for entry)
- **(703) 746-7239**, (for **Formal** communications intended for entry, except formal After Final communications)

Or:

- **(703) 746-7240**, (for **Informal or Draft** communications for discussion only, please label “**PROPOSED**” or “**DRAFT**”).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



CESAR B PAULA
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

7/21/03